

High resolution monitoring of nutrients in groundwater and surface waters: process understanding, quantification of loads and concentrations and management applications

F. C. van Geer^{1,2}, B. Kronvang³ and H. P. Broers¹

[1]{TNO – Geological Survey of the Netherlands, PO Box 80015, 3508 TA, Utrecht, The Netherlands}

[2]{ Department of Physical Geography, Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, P.O. Box 80115, 3508 TC Utrecht, the Netherlands }

[3]{ Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University, Vejlshøvej 25, 8600 Silkeborg, Denmark }

Correspondence to: B. Kronvang (bkr@bios.au.dk) and H.P. Broers (hans-peter.broers@tno.nl)

Abstract

Four sessions on “Monitoring Strategies: temporal trends in groundwater and surface water quality and quantity” at the EGU-conferences in 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 and a special issue of HESS form the background for this overview of the current state of high resolution monitoring of nutrients. The overview includes a summary of technologies applied in high frequency monitoring of nutrients in the special issue. Moreover, we present a new assessment of the objectives behind high frequency monitoring as classified into three main groups: i) Improved understanding of the underlying hydrological, chemical and biological processes (PU); ii) quantification of true nutrient concentrations and loads (Q); iii) operational management, including evaluation of the effects of mitigation measures (M). The contributions in the special issue focus on the implementation of high frequency monitoring within the broader context of policy making and management of water in Europe for support of EU Directives such as the Water Framework Directive, the Groundwater Directive and the Nitrates Directive. The overview presented enabled us to highlight the typical objectives encountered in the application of high frequency monitoring and to reflect on future developments and research needs in this growing field of expertise.

1

2 **1 Introduction**

3 The presence and dynamic behavior of nutrients in groundwater and surface water is an
4 important issue in water management, in particular in areas with intensive agriculture. This is,
5 for example, reflected in EU directives such as the Nitrates Directive (EU 1991), the Water
6 Framework Directive (*WFD*; EU 2000), the Groundwater Directive (*GWD*; EU 2006) and the
7 Monitoring Directive (EU, 2009). Member states are obliged to monitor and report on the
8 environmental status of the water bodies and, if necessary, take measures to establish adverse
9 trend reversal. As far as nutrients are concerned, the European directives focus on aquatic
10 ecosystems and groundwater-dependent ecosystems. In order to meet the obligations,
11 monitoring programs have to cover a range of water quantity, water quality and ecological
12 parameters, and an understanding of dynamic nutrient processes is required for these
13 programs to be efficient and cost effective. However, the design of monitoring strategies is
14 often hampered by limited knowledge of, for instance, nutrient responses to weather
15 conditions, land use and agricultural practices. Moreover, the behavior of nutrients shows
16 large variability in both space and time (see, e.g., Campbell et al., 2015, and Goyenola et al.,
17 2015).

18 To satisfy the increasing demand for knowledge and information on the dynamic behavior of
19 nutrients, the past 10-15 years have seen a rapid development of observation devices and
20 technologies for high resolution monitoring of nutrients and other solutes and isotopes at
21 affordable cost, encouraging researchers and other stakeholders to perform studies in
22 experimental as well as operational settings. Thus, vast amounts of research data have been
23 collected on various water quality variables, allowing the study of relevant biogeochemical
24 processes and enabling comparisons between the results obtained by the use of different
25 monitoring devices. Thus, awareness has increased about the advantage of using high
26 resolution nutrient monitoring as a complementary tool next to traditional low frequency
27 monitoring. The sessions on “Monitoring Strategies: temporal trends in groundwater and
28 surface water quality and quantity” at the EGU-conferences in 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015
29 clearly showed that high frequency monitoring and strategies for nutrient monitoring are
30 subjects that attract great interest. Part of the work presented at these sessions is now gathered
31 in the 10 papers included in this special issue of HESS, which aims to provide an overview of
32 the current state of high resolution monitoring of nutrients, identify important knowledge gaps

1 and to pinpoint future research needs and potential application of high resolution monitoring
2 in the management of groundwater and surface water resources. The main research questions
3 addressed are:

- 4 - What does the new monitoring technology have to offer and how can we develop an
5 optimal monitoring strategy?
- 6 - Can we assess and quantify the transport processes of nutrients, in particular at the
7 short time scale?
- 8 - How can we use high frequency nutrient monitoring to achieve our management
9 goals?

10

11

12 **2 Monitoring objectives**

13 An overview of monitoring objectives and time scales for high frequency nutrient monitoring
14 is given in Table 1. We distinguished between three main groups of monitoring objectives:

- 15 1. To improve our understanding of the underlying hydrological, chemical and biological
16 processes determining temporal and spatial patterns in nutrients (Process Understanding:
17 PU).
- 18 2. To quantify nutrient loads and concentrations (Quantification: Q).
- 19 3. To support operational water and environmental management, including evaluation of the
20 effects of mitigation measures and predictions (Management: M).

21 It should be noted that some papers address more than one of these overall objectives.

22

23 2.1 **Objective 1: Hydrological, chemical and biological process understanding**

24 Kirchner et al. (2004) addressed the new opportunities of high resolution monitoring for
25 understanding the functioning of catchments, and they foresaw a new era of technical
26 progress and study of actual data, making full profit of the newly acquired spectrum of signals
27 from very short to longer time scales. A decade later, a large number of papers and
28 presentations, including those at the EGU sessions, have demonstrated that process

1 understanding has indeed improved significantly. We have made a subdivision of the
2 monitoring objectives focusing on process understanding (PU):

- 3 • *PU1: Understanding flow regimes and nutrient dynamics.* These studies focus on the
4 behavior of one variable at a time in order to characterize flow regimes, flow and
5 concentration dynamics, hysteresis effects and extreme values of nutrient
6 concentrations and loads. Typically, high frequency monitoring via its high resolution
7 allows characterization of the concentration changes. Thus, the rising limb of the
8 hydrograph represents the short-scale transport processes. Examples can be found in
9 Goyenola et al. (2015) and Outram et al. (2014).
- 10 • *PU2: Characterization of transport routes and time scales.* These studies aim to detect
11 flow routes, groundwater-surface water interactions and travel time distributions with
12 emphasis on the interactions between variables in different hydrological
13 compartments, in particular those between groundwater and surface water. The added
14 value of high frequency monitoring is its ability to distinguish between fast and slow
15 flow components (see Poulsen et al. 2015b, Shreshta et al. 2013, Rozemeijer et al.
16 2010a, 2012). High frequency monitoring has also stimulated the development of new
17 approaches to characterize the transient nature of travel time distributions (Velde et al.
18 2010, Botter et al. 2011, Hrachowitz et al. 2015).
- 19 • *PU3: Characterization of retention processes.* These studies aim to gain insight into
20 the attenuation and retention processes determining the response of nutrients to driving
21 forces such as rainfall events, in both surface and ground water. High frequency
22 monitoring may, for example, reveal clear day-night cycles in nutrient concentrations,
23 contributing to the unraveling of retention and primary production processes in surface
24 waters (see, e.g., Rode et al. 2013). Quantifying denitrification processes using N-
25 isotopes together with calibration of flow models using nitrate and discharge data is a
26 promising approach when studying PU2 and PU3 objectives combined (Shershta et al.
27 2013).

28 2.2 Objective 2: Quantification of loads and concentrations

29 Quantification (Q) type monitoring objectives focus not on identifying and understanding the
30 processes but on the quantification of specified quantities, such as averages, probabilities and
31 proportions of exceedance of water quality standards. Typically, such objectives relate to
32 policy development and operational management, in particular relative to EU directives such

1 as the EU Nitrates Directive (EU 1991) and the Water Framework Directive (EU 2000). Q
2 type objectives are divided into 5 categories:

- 3 • *Q1: Assessment of typical or average concentrations, solute loads and export of*
4 *solute towards downstream waters.* Low frequency monitoring can give an estimate
5 of average concentrations and discharges over a time period via interpolation.
6 However, nutrient concentrations and discharges are frequently correlated. Short
7 duration concentration peaks likely go undetected using low frequency monitoring,
8 which implies that load estimates based on low frequency monitoring are typically
9 biased and too low (Rozemeijer et al. 2010a, Cassidy & Jordan 2011, Audet et al.
10 2014, Goyenola et al. 2015, Skeffington et al. 2015). In contrast, high frequency
11 monitoring reduces the bias in concentration distributions derived from under-
12 sampling of the concentration time series. (e.g. Jordan et al. 2007, Rozemeijer et al.
13 2010b, Ernstsens et al. 2015, Campbell et al. 2015). High frequency monitoring may
14 also reveal artefacts produced by the fact that regular sampling is normally undertaken
15 in the daytime, thus typically not capturing differences between daytime and night-
16 time fluxes (Neal et al. 2012, Van der Grift et al. 2016).
- 17 • *Q2: Assessment of temporal trends, quantification of trend slopes and identification of*
18 *trend directions.* High resolution monitoring, in combination with time series from
19 regular low frequency monitoring, may help to reveal the structure of water quality
20 time series, thereby allowing testing the significance of trends both deterministically
21 (e.g. Van der Grift et al. 2016) and statistically (Lloyd et al. 2014, Rozemeijer et al.
22 2014), for example using spectral analysis methods (Aubert et al. 2013, Blauw et al.
23 2013).
- 24 • *Q3: Testing compliance with water quality standards, such as WFD Environmental*
25 *Quality Standards.* This involves testing the frequency of exceedance of standards or
26 quantifying the probability of exceedance. High frequency monitoring improves these
27 aims by adding information on extreme values and short-term peaks impacting the
28 regular evaluation of exceedances in low frequency programs. Skeffington et al.
29 (2015b) clearly demonstrate that the classification of WFD Chemical and Ecological
30 Status is strongly influenced by sampling frequency and time of sampling during the
31 year and over the day.

- 1 • *Q4: Water and matter balances and sources.* Detection of (pollution) sources is often
2 difficult to capture in natural catchment systems, but high frequency monitoring can
3 add short time scale information on dilution or accumulation rates which helps source
4 apportionment and adds to improving water and mass balances (see Van der Grift et
5 al. 2016, Aubert et al. 2013b, Goyenola et al. 2015, Rozemeijer et al. 2010b).
- 6 • *Q5: Comparison of monitoring equipment.* Several recent studies endeavor to answer
7 the question of how high frequency monitoring equipment may supplement the
8 existing monitoring tools. The central question is ‘what are the possibilities of new
9 equipment?’ Examples of comparisons of new monitoring equipment used in surface
10 water and groundwater monitoring are found in Audet et al. (2014), Huebsch et al.
11 (2015), Jordan et al. (2013) and Rozemeijer et al. (2010c).

12 2.3 **Objective 3: Operational (real time) management – effects and predictions**

13 The central aim of the management (M) type monitoring objectives is an evaluation of the
14 impact of water and environmental management measures as well as climate change on
15 nutrient transport. M type objectives typically involve the reaction of the catchment to man-
16 made or natural changes of nutrient sources and the hydrological functioning or the
17 biogeochemistry of the system. We have defined three subgroups:

- 18 • *M1: Management and mitigation of point sources.* High frequency monitoring can
19 reveal any changes in the short-term reaction of the catchment to changes in nutrient
20 inputs, hydrology or biogeochemistry. Besides revealing the time-dependent nutrient
21 inputs from, for instance, sewage treatment facilities or leaking septic tanks (Wade et
22 al. 2012), the effects of mitigating measures can be followed by assessing changes in
23 the duration or frequency of nutrient peaks in the time series before and after their
24 implementation. Examples are given in Campbell et al. (2015) and Greene et al.
25 (2011).
- 26 • *M2: Management and mitigation of diffuse sources.* Mitigation measures for nutrients
27 in agricultural areas typically involve some kind of land use management or changes
28 in the hydrological functioning of the system. Despite the establishment of high
29 frequency monitoring, the effects of mitigation measures are often difficult to separate
30 from those of natural variability created by meteorological conditions or from spatial
31 variations in governing variables such as soil types and subsurface reactivity.

1 Examples of monitoring the effects of mitigation measures in diffuse pollution settings
2 are given in Campbell et al. (2015), Ernstsen et al. (2015), Van der Grift et al. (2015)
3 and Rozemeijer et al. (2016), all included in this special issue, and Greene et al.
4 (2011). Given the slower dynamics of groundwater, other techniques such as age
5 dating and lower monitoring frequencies are usually applied to reveal trends following
6 implementation of mitigation measures (Broers & Van der Grift 2004, Visser et al.
7 2007, 2009, Hansen et al. 2012, 2013).

- 8 • *M3: Climate change and mitigation measures.* High frequency monitoring helps
9 reveal the impact of and adaptations to climate change by capturing changes in the
10 hydrological and hydro chemical response to rainfall events and testing whether the
11 projected changes in catchment behavior actually occur. Examples are given in
12 Graeber et al. (2015) and Goyenola et al. (2015).

14 **3 Information time scales**

15 The scale at which information is required is termed “information scale”. Information scale is
16 important when designing monitoring systems and choosing the methods and goals for data
17 processing (Broers 2002, Van Geer et al. 2006). For instance, selection of monitoring
18 equipment and choice of methods for data smoothing require a properly defined information
19 scale, and the papers and abstracts are therefore grouped according to this (Table 1). For each
20 monitoring objective, the required information depends on the scale at which the information
21 is needed. The following three temporal scales are considered:

- 22 - Short-scale dynamics and extreme events (minutes to weeks).
- 23 - Seasonal and annual patterns (months to several years).
- 24 - Longer term behavior and trends (years to decades).

25 Specific monitoring objectives may require a specific information scale. This we illustrate for
26 the monitoring objective ‘characterizing groundwater surface water interaction’. Typically,
27 analysis of the response of nitrate concentrations in surface water to rainfall events is of short
28 temporal scale (minutes or hours). To estimate average loads from shallow groundwater
29 towards surface water during the growing season, the information scale required will involve
30 one or several seasons. To evaluate the long-term sustainability of groundwater-dependent

1 aquatic ecosystems in a WFD assessment, the information scale may cover several years or
2 decades.

3 Irrespective of the time scale of the monitoring objective, observations contain variations at
4 all time scales and the gathered data have to be processed and statistically filtered in order to
5 obtain the correct trend information or system characteristics at the desired time scale (e.g.
6 Lloyd et al. 2014).

7 3.1 Short time scales

8 Obviously, to obtain information at short time scales, high frequent monitoring is required
9 and data processing will include high pass filters. Concentrations and loads of nutrients
10 frequently show rapid changes over time as a result of rainfall events, emissions of effluents
11 from point sources and unintended losses of manure or pesticides during application. Often,
12 these rapid changes occur at time scales less than one hour and high frequency monitoring is
13 required in order to capture peaks and extreme values that would go undetected if applying
14 only low frequency monitoring (cf. Campbell et al. 2015, Skeffington et al. 2015b, Van der
15 Grift et al. 2016).

16 Also, if assessing the statistical characteristics of the concentration or the load of a solute (e.g.
17 average and percentile values or the frequency of exceedance of a threshold), high frequency
18 monitoring is a valuable tool. In principle, statistical characteristics can be determined from
19 low frequency observations provided that the monitoring period is sufficiently long. However,
20 in many cases the system shows statistically non-stationary behavior over longer periods of
21 time due to, for example, changes in land use management. High frequency monitoring,
22 enables the estimation of trend characteristics in shorter periods, being less sensible for
23 longer-term trends (e.g. Lloyd et al. 2014). Many studies focus on the interactions between
24 groundwater and surface water, in particular the different flow paths of nutrients towards the
25 surface water (cf. Poulsen et al. 2015b, Rozemeijer et al. 2010b). The weather conditions
26 appear to be the major driving force for the temporal distribution of fluxes along the different
27 flow paths, including quick components like discharges from point sources, tile drain water
28 and overland flow and slow components such as discharges from deeper groundwater. The
29 quick components have response times in the order of magnitude of hours, days or weeks.
30 Therefore, the response of nutrient fluxes and loads to precipitation is a complex function
31 (e.g. Van der Velde et al. 2010). To estimate this complex response function and to unravel

1 the contributions of the different flow paths, high frequency monitoring is a prerequisite (cf.
2 Campbell et al. 2015).

3 **3.2 Seasonal and annual patterns and long term behavior**

4 An example of an objective with a seasonal information scale is the estimation of average or
5 typical nutrient concentrations during the growing season. An example of a long-term
6 monitoring objective is found in the WFD, which include elucidating the trends in water
7 quality status towards the 2027 compliance with good chemical status and meeting the
8 environmental objectives for aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems (cf. Rozemeijer et al. 2014,
9 Erntsen et al. 2015, Skeffington et al. 2015b). As to groundwater, an equivalent time scale is
10 required for demonstrating the trend reversal in concentrations of nitrate (Visser et al. 2007).
11 Although high frequency information (days to weeks) is not required for the analysis of
12 seasonal and annual patterns and long term behavior, high frequent monitoring can be
13 beneficial, because often statistical characteristics and input-response relations can be inferred
14 reliable from a shorter monitoring period. Individual observations of water quality are the
15 result of variation at a wide range of frequencies. High frequency variations (noise) tend to
16 obscure the low frequency signal. High frequency monitoring enables filtering out the noise
17 (low pass filter) during relatively short monitoring periods in order to elucidate the long-term
18 trend (Bierkens et al. 1999, Halliday et al. 2012, Aubert et al. 2013, Lloyd et al. 2014, Van der
19 Grift 2016).

20

21 **4 Monitoring equipment**

22 Several types of sensors have been developed in recent years. Some are based on *in situ*
23 laboratory (mobile or stationary) analysis of water samples, while others utilize, for instance,
24 light or infrared (UV) spectra to measure chemical parameters (e.g. turbidity, nitrate, DOM)
25 or materials capable of passive adsorption of chemicals (e.g. Sorbicells). Some sampling
26 methods produce point observations in time, whereas others derive flow- or time-weighted
27 concentrations over a time period. A number of studies (e.g. Rozemeijer et al. 2010c, Cassidy
28 and Jordan 2011, Jordan et al. 2013, Huebsch et al. 2015) compare several sampling
29 instruments and monitoring strategies (Table 2). Various continuous monitoring methods, in
30 particular those described in the papers presented in this special issue, are listed in Table 2.

31

1 Table 2: Overview of monitoring methods and instruments applied in the Session abstracts
 2 and Special Issue papers.

Monitoring methods	Instruments	References to papers in the special issue describing the results of studies in which the instruments were applied
Nitrate sensors	- scan spectrolyser TM , scan Messtechnik GmbH, Austria - NITRATAX plus sc, Hach Lange GmbH, Germany - reagentless hyperspectral UV photometer (ProPS)	Huebsch et al. (2015) Van der Grift et al. (2016) Rozemeijer et al. (2010c) Wade et al. (2012) Heinz et al. (2014)
Phosphorus (total P, total reactive P)	Phosphax Sigma auto-analyzer, Hach Lange GmbH, Düsseldorf, Germany C	Campbell et al. (2015) Rozemeijer et al. (2016) Skeffington et al. (2015b) Van der Grift et al. (2016)
(Total reactive phosphorus, TRP), nitrite (NO ₂) and ammonium (NH ₄)	Systea Micromac C	Wade et al. (2012)
Passive samplers	SorbiCell-samplers (De Jonge & Rothenberg, 2005)	Rozemeijer et al. (2010c, 2015) Audet et al. (2014)
Turbidity	OBS sensor, Campbell Scientific	Van der Grift et al. (2016)
Automatic samplers	Isco sampler; Sigmatax sampler	Goyenola et al. (2015) Audet et al. (2014) Van der Grift et al. (2016)
O ₂ , pH, temperature conductivity, turbidity and chlorophyll	- YSI 6600 multi-parameter sonde	Skeffington et al. (2015b) Wade et al. (2012)
Conductivity, temperature	CTD-diver (Van Essen Instruments, Delft, the Netherlands)	Van der Grift et al. (2016)
¹⁸ O, ² H	Wavelength-Scanned Cavity Ring Down Spectrometry System (WS-CRDS) L2120-i Picarro	Heinz et al. (2014)

3

4 **5 Conclusions and future outlook**

5 Based on the observations and findings described at the 5 EGU sessions together with the 10
 6 papers included in the present special issue, some general conclusions can be drawn.

7 Several research groups in Europe and beyond are undertaking pilot studies on the use of high
 8 frequency monitoring of nutrients. During the past decades, there has been growing awareness
 9 of the fact that the quality of the aquatic environment is threatened by high concentrations and
 10 loads of nutrients in groundwater and surface water. At the same time, development of
 11 observation equipment enabling high frequency monitoring at affordable cost has been
 12 extensive and, accordingly, assessment and quantification of the dynamic behavior of
 13 nutrients at very small time scales (minutes to hours) are now feasible. Most testing has been
 14 devoted to process understanding (PU) and quantification of concentrations and loads (Q)
 15 (Table 1).,Quantification of concentrations and loads to be used in the status assessments

1 required by the EU Water Framework Directive has received much attention by several
2 European research groups during the last five years. However, only few papers and
3 contributions cover aspects of the monitoring effects of river basin management plans that
4 have been implemented to reduce pollution by nutrients or climate change impacts. Although
5 full-scale application of high frequency monitoring at national or regional scale may not
6 always be reported in scientific papers, we believe that its use in operational water
7 management is still limited. The papers listed in Table 1 show that different monitoring
8 methods have been successfully implemented and tested and it is a step forward towards
9 implementation of these kinds of applications in national or regional monitoring programs in
10 the coming years.

11 Some papers present comparisons between different observation methods and equipment, and
12 others discuss the technical issues related to the observation devices, and it appears that
13 sensors and other equipment have measurement errors differing from those of traditional
14 laboratory analyses. This may, for example, be due to the required regular calibration and the
15 often high maintenance effort of equipment.

16 High frequency monitoring produces time series that enable us to unravel the transport
17 processes of nutrients, for example the contribution of different flow routes or the ratio
18 between statistically stationary fluctuations and structural trends. The fast-growing amount of
19 data requires development of new analysis techniques to handle the large data sets. The error
20 statistics of the new equipment in combination with the large amount of data require also new
21 techniques for QA/QC.

22 Research into high frequency nutrient monitoring will continue. Here, we focus on the
23 development expected for the near future:

24 Today, high frequency monitoring of nutrients is subject to research and pilot studies, but we
25 expect a transition from research to implementation in operational practice. This transition
26 requires the design of efficient and cost-effective monitoring programs, for which research is
27 needed to identify the best combination of observation devices and how to best integrate the
28 data from these devices with dynamic models describing the evolution of nutrients in time and
29 space. Well-defined monitoring objectives are prerequisite for optimum monitoring strategies
30 (observation devices, spatial and temporal distribution) .

31 High frequency monitoring will become part of the routine work flow of agencies within
32 groundwater and surface water quality management and vast amounts of data will be

1 generated. Often long time series are necessary, for example to assess trends over longer
2 periods of time. Therefore, a robust system for data storage, QA/QC and easy access data
3 availability is of great importance (e.g. Neal et al.2011).Today, data processing (e.g. to assess
4 trends) is hampered by the short duration of the time series. However, with increasing
5 availability of long time series, application of advanced statistical time series analysis
6 methods becomes feasible (Lloyd et al. 2014). We expect that more research will be
7 conducted into the application of statistically based techniques, such as transfer function -
8 noise models, to deduce the characteristics of the series and to quantify the relationship with
9 other hydrological variables (e.g. Van der Grift et al. 2016). Examples of characteristics may
10 be typical seasonal behavior, the memory of the system and the trend. Examples of
11 relationships are the response of nutrients to meteorological variables or to water
12 management. Such time series analysis techniques will have applications in studying the
13 effects of climate change on the functioning of catchments, e.g. by elucidating the changing
14 response times of water and solutes towards precipitation and drought events.

15 High frequency data will in the future assist in achieving a better understanding about in-
16 stream processes such as nitrogen and phosphorus assimilation, sedimentation and
17 resuspension processes. Moreover, water quality models will be challenged when calibrated
18 against high frequency data which in turn will force models to be more dynamic (run at lower
19 time steps) and improve their internal process descriptions.

20 High frequency monitoring data will also be able to assist water managers in getting a true
21 picture of nutrient loadings and sources that will enable River Basin managers to implement
22 more targeted and thereby cost-effective decisions when fulfilling the requirement under the
23 EU Directives directed at water management such as the Water Framework Directive, the
24 Nitrates Directive and the Groundwater Directive.

25 The future will likely see more emphasis on multi-variable analysis, in which monitoring set-
26 up, data collection and data processing are not made for one variable at a time but within a
27 multi-variate framework. Such a framework can include the dynamic modelling of travel
28 times, the age dating of contributing flow routes (e.g. Gilmore et al. 2016) and the inclusion
29 of other tracers of flow processes that can be monitored at high resolution, including isotopes
30 of water ($^{18}\text{O}/^2\text{H}$) and products of radioactive decay in the subsurface (e.g. ^{222}Rn).

31 Future research into observation devices will probably concentrate on the combination of
32 different types of high frequency sensors to improve our knowledge of biogeochemical

1 processes, such as nitrate attenuation processes, phosphorus retention, in groundwater and
2 surface waters. Development of equipment (sensors) will likely continue in the coming years,
3 in particular to create cost effective, more precise and more robust and low-maintenance
4 monitoring devices.

5

6 **6 Acknowledgements**

7 The work is a contribution to the BufferTech project under the Innovation Foundation in
8 Denmark (Grant No. 1305-00017B) and supported by the Strategic Research Funding of
9 TNO.

10

1 7 References

- 2 Aubert, A. H., Ch. Gascuel-Oudou Ch., G. Gruau, N. Akkal, M. Faucheux, et al.: Solute transport dynamics in
3 small, shallow groundwater-dominated agricultural catchments: insights from a high-frequency,
4 multisolute 10 yr-long monitoring study. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, European*
5 *Geosciences Union*, 17 (4), 1379-1391, 2013b.
- 6 Aubert, A. H., Kirchner, J. W., Gascuel-Oudou, C., Faucheux, M., Gruau, G., and Mérot, P.: Fractal water
7 quality fluctuations spanning the periodic table in an intensively farmed watershed. *Environmental*
8 *Science and Technology*, 48(2), 930-937, 2014.
- 9 Audet, J., Martinsen, L., Hasler, B., de Jonge, H., Karydi, E., Ovesen, N. B., and Kronvang, B.: Comparison of
10 sampling methodologies for nutrient monitoring in streams: uncertainties, costs and implications
11 for mitigation, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 18, 4721-4731, doi:10.5194/hess-18-4721-2014, 2014.
- 12 Bieroza, M. and Heathwaite, L.: The value of automated high-frequency nutrient monitoring in inference of
13 biogeochemical processes, temporal variability and trends, *Geophysical Research Abstracts* 15,
14 EGU2013-8300, 2013.
- 15 Bieroza, M. Z, Heathwaite, A. L, Mullinger, N. J and Keenan, P. O: Understanding nutrient biogeochemistry in
16 agricultural catchments: the challenge of appropriate monitoring frequencies, *Environmental*
17 *Science: Processes and Impacts*, 16, 7, 1676-1691, Royal Society of Chemistry, 2014.
- 18 Bierkens, M. F., Knotters, M., and Van Geer, F. C. : Calibration of transfer function–noise models to sparsely or
19 irregularly observed time series, *Water resources research*, 35(6), 1741-1750, 1999.
- 20 Blauw, A., Beninca E., Laane R., Greenwoord N. and Huisman, J.: Dancing with the Tides: Fluctuations of
21 Coastal Phytoplankton Orchestrated by Different Oscillatory Modes of the Tidal Cycle, *EGU*
22 *General Assembly Conference Abstracts* , 15, EGU2013-138660, 2013.
- 23 Botter, G., Bertuzzo, E., and Rinaldo, A.: Catchment residence and travel time distributions: The master
24 equation. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38(11), 2011.
- 25 Broers, H. P., Strategies for regional groundwater quality monitoring, *Nederlandse Geografische Studies* 306, p.
26 231., <http://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/37373/broers.pdf>.
- 27 Broers, H. P. and Van der Grift, B.: Regional monitoring of temporal changes in groundwater quality. *Journal of*
28 *Hydrology*, 296, 192-220, 2004.
- 29 Broers, H. P., Rozemeijer, J., and Klein, J.: A national scale monitoring network for nutrients in agriculture
30 dominated headwaters in the Netherlands, *EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts*, 14,
31 8240, 2012.
- 32 Campbell, J. M., Jordan, P., and Arnscheidt, J.: Using high-resolution phosphorus data to investigate mitigation
33 measures in headwater river catchments, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 19, 453-464, doi:10.5194/hess-
34 19-453-2015, 2015.
- 35 Cassidy, R., and Jordan, P.: Limitations of instantaneous water quality sampling in surface-water catchments:
36 comparison with near-continuous phosphorus time-series data, *Journal of Hydrology*, 405(1), 182-
37 193, 2011.

1 Cassidy, R., Jordan, P., and Macintosh, K.: Comparisons of high-frequency nutrient flux data with passive and
2 low frequency alternatives in Irish rivers, EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts, 14, 7515,
3 2012.

4 De Jonge, H., Karydi, E. and Kronvang, B.: Test of a new passive sampler in running waters: SorbiCell,
5 Geophysical Research Abstracts, 14, EGU2012-11470, 2012.

6 Ernstsens, V., Olsen, P., Rosenbom, A. E. and Plauborg, F.: Long term dynamics of nitrate concentrations and
7 leaching losses in tile drainage water from cultivated clayey till fields, Geophysical Research
8 Abstracts, 16, 12786, 2014.

9 Ernstsens, V., Olsen, P., and Rosenbom, A. E.: Long-term monitoring of nitrate transport to drainage from three
10 agricultural clayey till fields, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19, 3475-3488, doi:10.5194/hess-19-3475-
11 2015, 2015.

12 EU, Directive 91/676/EEC concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from
13 agricultural sources, 1991

14 EU, Directive 2000/70/EC: The EU Water Framework Directive, 2000.

15 EU, Directive 2006/118/EC: The EU Groundwater Directive, 2006.

16 EU, Directive 2009/90/EC: The Monitoring Directive, 2009.

17 Faucheux, M., Fovet, O., Gruau, G., Jaffrézic, A., Petitjean, P., Gascuel-Oudou, C. and Ruiz, L.: Real time high
18 frequency monitoring of water quality in river streams using a UV-visible spectrometer: interest,
19 limits and consequences for monitoring strategies, Geophysical Research Abstracts 15, EGU2013-
20 9425, 2013.

21 Gilmore, T. E., Genereux, D. P., Solomon, D. K. and Solder, J. E. (2016), Groundwater transit time distribution
22 and mean from streambed sampling in an agricultural coastal plain watershed, North Carolina,
23 USA. Water Resour. Res.. Accepted Author Manuscript. doi:10.1002/2015WR017600

24 Goyenola, G., Meerhof, M., Teixeira de Mello, F., González-Bergonzoni, I., Graeber, D., Vidal, N., Mazzeo, N.,
25 Ovesen, N., Jeppesen, E., Thodsen, H. and Kronvang, B.: Monitoring the effects of climate and
26 agriculture intensity on nutrient fluxes in lowland streams: a comparison between temperate
27 Denmark and subtropical Uruguay, Geophysical Research Abstracts, 16, EGU2014-4423, 2014

28 Goyenola, G., Meerhoff, M., Teixeira-de Mello, F., González-Bergonzoni, I., Graeber, D., Fosalba, C., Vidal, N.,
29 Mazzeo, N., Ovesen, N. B., Jeppesen, E., and Kronvang, B.: Monitoring strategies of stream
30 phosphorus under contrasting climate-driven flow regimes, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19, 4099-
31 4111, doi:10.5194/hess-19-4099-2015, 2015.

32 Graeber, D., Meerhof, M., Zwirnmann, E., Ovesen, N., Gelbrecht, J., Teixeira de Mello, F., González-
33 Bergonzoni, I., Jeppesen, E. and Kronvang, B.: Amount, composition and seasonality of dissolved
34 organic carbon and nitrogen export from agriculture in contrasting climates, Geophysical Research
35 Abstracts, 16, EGU2014-7458, 2014.

36 Graeber, D., Goyenola, G., Meerhoff, M., Zwirnmann, E., Ovesen, N. B., Glendell, M., Gelbrecht, J., Teixeira de
37 Mello, F., González-Bergonzoni, I., Jeppesen, E., and Kronvang, B.: Interacting effects of climate
38 and agriculture on fluvial DOM in temperate and subtropical catchments, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.,
39 19, 2377-2394, doi:10.5194/hess-19-2377-2015, 2015.

- 1 Greene, S., Taylor, D., McElarney, Y. R., Foy, R. H. and Jordan, P.: An evaluation of catchment-scale
2 phosphorus mitigation using load apportionment modelling. *Science of the Total Environment*,
3 409(11), 2211-2221, 2011.
- 4 Halliday, S. J., Wade, A. J., Skeffington, R. A., Neal, C., Reynolds, B., Rowland, P., Neal, M. and Norris, D.:
5 An analysis of longterm trends, seasonality and short-term dynamics in water quality data from
6 Plynlimon, Wales, *Sci. Total Environ*: 434 (0), 186–200, 2012.
- 7 Halliday, S., Skeffington R., Wade A. , Neal C., Norris D. and Kirchner J.: Streamwater nitrate dynamics across
8 decadal to sub-daily timescales in an upland system in mid-Wales. *Geophysical Research*
9 *Abstracts*, 16, EGU2014-12512, 2014a.
- 10 Halliday, S., Wade, A., Skeffington, R., Bowes, M., Gozzard, E., Palmer-Felgate, E., Newman, J., Jarvie, H. and
11 Loewenthal, M. : The impact of sampling regime on the accuracy of water quality status
12 classifications under the Water Framework Directive, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 16,
13 EGU2014-12705, 2014b.
- 14 Hansen, B., Thorling, L., Dalgaard, T. and Erlandsen, M. : Trend Analyses of Nitrate in Danish Groundwater,
15 *EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts*, 14, 5696), 2012.
- 16 Hansen, B., Dalgaard, T., Thorling, L., Sørensen, B. and Erlandsen, M.: Regional analysis of groundwater nitrate
17 concentrations and trends in Denmark in regard to agricultural influence, *Biogeosciences*, 9(8),
18 3277-3286, 2012.
- 19 Hansen, B., Thorling, L., Sørensen, B., Dalgaard, T. and Erlandsen, M.: How does the Danish Groundwater
20 Monitoring Programme support statistical consistent nitrate trend analyses in groundwater?, *EGU*
21 *General Assembly Conference Abstracts*, 15, 7672, 2013.
- 22 Harrigan, S., Murphy, C., Hall, J. and Wilby, R.: Complexities in the attribution of trends: disentangling drivers
23 of change and the importance of metadata, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 15, EGU2013-13178,
24 2013.
- 25 Heinz, E., Kraft, P., Buchen, C., Frede, H. G., Aquino, E. and Breuer, L.: Set up of an automatic water quality
26 sampling system in irrigation agriculture. *Sensors*, 14(1), 212-228, 2013.
- 27 Hooijboer, A., Buis, E., Fraters, D., Boumans, L., Lukacs, S. and Vrijhoef, A.: Monitoring the effects of manure
28 policy in the Peat region, Netherlands, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 16, EGU2014-6133,
29 2014.
- 30 Hrachowitz, M., Fovet, O., Ruiz, L. and Savenije, H. H.: Transit time distributions, legacy contamination and
31 variability in biogeochemical $1/f\alpha$ scaling: how are hydrological response dynamics linked to
32 water quality at the catchment scale?., *Hydrological Processes*, 29(25), 5241-5256, 2015.
- 33 Huebsch, M., Grimmeisen, F., Zemann, M., Fenton, O., Richards, K. G., Jordan, P., Sawarieh, A., Blum, P. and
34 Goldscheider, N.: Technical Note: Field experiences using UV/VIS sensors for high-resolution
35 monitoring of nitrate in groundwater, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 19, 1589-1598, doi:10.5194/hess-
36 19-1589-2015, 2015.
- 37 Jomaa, S., Alsuliman, M. and Rode, M.: Turbidity-based methods for continuous estimates of suspended
38 sediment, particulate carbon, phosphorus and nitrogen fluxes, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 17,
39 EGU2015-12915-1, 2015

1 Jonczyk, J., Haygarth, P., Quinn, P. and Reaney, S.: The Influence of temporal sampling regime on the WFD
2 classification of catchments within the Eden Demonstration Test Catchment Project, Geophysical
3 Research Abstracts, 16, EGU2014-13271, 2014

4 Jordan, P., Arnscheidt A., McGrogan H. and McCormick S.: Characterising phosphorus transfers in rural
5 catchments using a continuous bank-side analyser, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 11, 372-381, 2007.

6 Jordan, P., Melland A.R., Mellander P.E., Shortle G. and Wall D.: The seasonality of phosphorus transfers from
7 land to water: Implications for trophic impacts and policy evaluation. Science of the Total
8 Environment 434 (2012) 101–109, 2012.

9 Jordan, P., Cassidy, R., Macintosh, K. A. and Arnscheidt, J.: Field and laboratory tests of flow-proportional
10 passive samplers for determining average phosphorus and nitrogen concentration in rivers,
11 Environmental science & technology, 47(5), 2331-2338, 2013.

12 Kirchner, J. W., Feng, X., Neal, C. and Robson, A. J.: The fine structure of water- quality dynamics: the (high-
13 frequency) wave of the future, Hydrological Processes, 18(7), 1353-1359, 2004.

14 Kronvang, B., Bøgestrand, J., Windolf, J., Ovesen, N. and Trolborg, L.: Background phosphorus
15 concentrations in Danish groundwater and surface water bodies, EGU General Assembly
16 Conference Abstracts, 15, 2249, 2013.

17 Lloyd, C., Freer, J., Johnes, P., Collins, A. and the Hampshire Avon DTC Team.: A framework for analysing
18 water quality observations to detect change in the context of natural variability and uncertainty,
19 Geophysical Research Abstracts, 14, EGU2012-10813-1, 2012.

20 Lloyd, C., Freer, J., Johnes, P., Collins, A. and the Hampshire Avon DTC Team : Assessing the effects of
21 sampling design on water quality status classification, Geophysical Research Abstracts, 15,
22 EGU2013-13032, 2013.

23 Lloyd, C. E. M., Freer, J. E., Collins, A. L., Johnes, P. J. and Jones, J. I.: Methods for detecting change in
24 hydrochemical time series in response to targeted pollutant mitigation in river catchments, Journal
25 of Hydrology, 514, 297-312, 2014.

26 Melland, A. R., Mellander, P-E., Murphy, P. N. C., Wall, D.P., Mehan, S., Shine, O., Shortle, G. and Jordan, P.:
27 Catchment monitoring technologies to identify critical source areas and times for nitrate transfer to
28 streams, Geophysical Research Abstracts, Vol. 14, EGU2012-9918, 2012

29 Melland, A., Jordan, P., Murphy, P., Mellander, P and Shortle, G.: A review of monitoring approaches and
30 outcomes of surface water quality mitigation measures in meso-scale agricultural catchments,
31 Geophysical Research Abstracts, 15, EGU2013-10446, 2013

32 Neal, C., Reynolds, B., Rowland, P., Norris, D., Kirchner, J. W., Neal, M. and Guyatt, H.: High-frequency water
33 quality time series in precipitation and streamflow: From fragmentary signals to scientific
34 challenge. Science of the Total Environment, 434, 3-12, 2012.

35 Neal, C., Reynolds, B., Norris, D., Kirchner, J. W., Neal, M., Rowland, P. and Lawlor, A.: Three decades of
36 water quality measurements from the Upper Severn experimental catchments at Plynlimon, Wales:
37 an openly accessible data resource for research, modelling, environmental management and
38 education, Hydrological Processes, 25(24), 3818-3830, 2011.

- 1 Oosterwoud, M., Keller, T., Musolff, A., Frei, S., Park, J-H. and Fleckenstein, J. H.: Investigating DOC export
2 dynamics using high-frequency instream concentration measurements, *Geophysical Research*
3 *Abstracts*, 16, EGU2014-15385, 2014
- 4 Outram, F. N., Lloyd, C. E. M., Jonczyk, J., Benskin, C. M., Grant, F., Perks, M. T. and Haygarth, P. M.: High-
5 frequency monitoring of nitrogen and phosphorus response in three rural catchments to the end of
6 the 2011–2012 drought in England, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 18(9), 3429-3448,
7 2014.
- 8 Ovesen, N. B., Windolf, J. and Kronvang, B.: Monitoring runoff and nutrient transport in the coastal zone of a
9 Danish lowland river, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, Vol. 14, EGU2012-11357, 2012
- 10 Ovesen, N.B., Windolf, J. and Kronvang, B.: Monitoring runoff and nutrient transport in the coastal zone of a
11 Danish lowland river, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 15, EGU2013-2246, 2013.
- 12 Poulsen, J. B., Ovesen, N.B., Windolf, J. and Kronvang, B.: Water and nutrient transport in a tidal influenced
13 Danish lowland river: monitoring strategies and model validation, *Geophysical Research*
14 *Abstracts*, 16, EGU2014-15712, 2014.
- 15 Poulsen, J. R., Kronvang, B., Ovesen, N., Piil, K. and Hvid, S.: A new emission-based approach for regulation of
16 N losses from agricultural areas to surface waters, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 17, EGU2015-
17 9113, 2015a.
- 18 Poulsen, J. R., Sebok, E., Duque, C., Tetzlaff, D. and Engesgaard, P. K.: Detecting groundwater discharge
19 dynamics from point-to-catchment scale in a lowland stream: combining hydraulic and tracer
20 methods, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 19, 1871-1886, doi:10.5194/hess-19-1871-2015, 2015b.
- 21 Quinn, P., Jonczyk, J., Owen, J., Barber, N., Adams, R., O'Donnell, G. and EdenDTC Team: The role of high
22 frequency monitoring in understanding nutrient pollution processes to address catchment
23 management issues, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 17, EGU2015-6221-1, 2015
- 24 Rode, M., Kiwel, U., Knoeller, K. and Zacharias, S.: A New Online Water Quality Monitoring System within
25 the TERENO Hydrological Observatory “Bode”, Germany, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 14,
26 EGU2012-5790, 2012.
- 27 Rode, M., Knoeller, K. and Kiwel, U.: Investigating in-stream nitrogen removal at variable flow conditions using
28 new optical sensors, *Geophysical Research Abstracts* 15, EGU2013-4326, 2013.
- 29 Rode, M., Halbebel, S., Anis, M., R. and Weitere, M.: Coupling of primary production and diel nitrate dynamics
30 in a eutrophic lowland river system in central Germany, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 16,
31 EGU2014-9999, 2014.
- 32 Rozemeijer, J. and Broers, H.P.: The groundwater contribution to surface water contamination in a Dutch
33 province with intensive agricultural land use, *Environmental Pollution* 148(3): 695-706, 2007.
- 34 Rozemeijer J. C., Van der Velde, Y. C. Van Geer, F.C., De Rooij Torfs, P. J. J. F and Broers, H. P.: Improving
35 load estimates of N and P in surface waters by characterizing the concentration response to rainfall
36 events, *Environmental Science and Technology*, 44 :6305–6312, 2010a.
- 37 Rozemeijer J.C., Van der Velde, Y., van Geer, F. C., Bierkens, M. F. P. and Broers, H. P.: Direct measurements
38 of the tile drain and groundwater flow route contributions to surface water contamination: from
39 field-scale concentration patterns in groundwater to catchment-scale surface water quality,
40 *Environmental Pollution*, 158:3571-3579, 2010b.

- 1 Rozemeijer, J.C., Velde, Y. van der, De Jonge, H., Broers, H. P., Van Geer F. C. and Bierkens, M. F. P.:
2 Application and Evaluation of a New Passive Sampler for Measuring Average Solute
3 Concentrations in a Catchment Scale Water Quality Monitoring Study, *Environmental Science and*
4 *Technology*, 44, 1353 – 1359, 2010c.
- 5 Rozemeijer, J. C., Van der Velde, Y., Broers, H. P. and Van Geer, F. C.: Dynamics in surface water solute
6 concentrations and consequences for water quality monitoring, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*,
7 Vol. 14, EGU2012-5013, 2012
- 8 Rozemeijer, J. C., Van der Velde, Y., Broers, H.P. and Van Geer, F.C. : Applications of continuous water
9 quality monitoring techniques for more efficient water quality research and management,
10 *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 15, EGU2013-10264, 2013.
- 11 Rozemeijer, J.C., Klein, J., Broers, H.P., Van Tol-Leenders, T.P., Van der Grift, B.: Water quality status and
12 trends in agriculture-dominated headwaters; a national monitoring network for assessing the
13 effectiveness of national and European manure legislation in The Netherlands, *Environmental*
14 *Monitoring and Assessment*, 186, 8981–8995, 2014.
- 15 Rozemeijer, J. C., Visser, A., Borren, W., Winegram, M., Van der Velde, Y., Klein, J., and Broers, H. P.: High-
16 frequency monitoring of water fluxes and nutrient loads to assess the effects of controlled drainage
17 on water storage and nutrient transport, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 20, 347-358, doi:10.5194/hess-
18 20-347-2016, 2016.
- 19 Schneider, P., Hetzenauer, H. and Doppler, T.: Towards improved water quality assessment: comparison of
20 surface water sampling strategies, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 14, 13665, 2012.
- 21 Shrestha, R. R., Osenbrück, K., and Rode, M.: Assessment of catchment response and calibration of a
22 hydrological model using high-frequency discharge–nitrate concentration data, *Hydrology*
23 *Research*, 44(6), 995-1012, 2013.
- 24 Shrestha, R. R., Osenbrück, K., Rode, M.: Assessment of catchment response and calibration of a hydrological
25 model using high-frequency discharge–nitrate concentration data, *Hydrology Research*, 44, 995-
26 1012, 2013.
- 27 Skeffington, R. A., Halliday, S. J., Wade, A. J., Bowes, M. J., and Loewenthal, M.: Using high-frequency water
28 quality data to assess sampling strategies for the EU Water Framework Directive, *Hydrol. Earth*
29 *Syst. Sci.*, 19, 2491-2504, doi:10.5194/hess-19-2491-2015, 2015.
- 30 Stadler, P., Vogl, W., Koschelnik, J., Epp, M., Lackner, M., Oismüller, M., Kumpan, M., Strauss, P., Sommer,
31 R., Ryzinska-Paier, G., Farnleitner, A. H. and Zessner, M.: Testing the applicability of rapid on-
32 site enzymatic activity detection for surface water monitoring, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*,
33 17, EGU2015-10547, 2015.
- 34 Van der Grift, B., Broers, H. P., Berendrecht, W. L., Rozemeijer, J. C., Osté, L. A., and Griffioen, J.: High-
35 frequency monitoring reveals nutrient sources and transport processes in an agriculture-dominated
36 lowland water system, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sc.*, 20, 1851-1868, doi:10.5194/hess-20-1851-2016,
37 2016.
- 38 Van der Velde Y., De Rooij G. H., Rozemeijer, J. C., Van Geer, F. C, and Broers H. P.: Nitrate response of a
39 lowland catchment: on the relation between stream concentration and travel time distribution
40 dynamics, *Water Resources Research*, (46)11, 2010.

1 Van der Velde, Y. and Rozemeijer, J. C.: Continuous phosphorus measurements reveal catchment-scale transport
2 processes. *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 14, EGU2012-9066, 2012.

3 Van Geer F. C., Bierkens M. F. P. and Broers H. P. Groundwater Monitoring Strategies, *Encyclopedia of*
4 *Hydrological Sciences*, doi:10.1002/0470848944.hsa316, 2006

5 Vendelboe, A.L., De Jonge, H., Rozemeijer, J. and Wollesen-de Jonge, L.: Continuous Passive Sampling of
6 Solutes from Agricultural Subsurface Drainage Tubes, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 17,
7 EGU2015-14310, 2015.

8 Visser, A., Broers, H. P., and Bierkens, M. F. P.: Demonstrating trend reversal in groundwater quality in relation
9 to time of recharge determined by $3\text{H}/3\text{He}$ dating. *Environmental Pollution* 148(3): 797-807, 2007.

10 Visser, A., Dubus I. Broers H. P., Brouyère S., Korcz, M., Orban P., Goderniaux, P., , Batlle-Aguilar, J., Surdyk,
11 N., Amraoui, N., Job H., Pinault J. L. and Bierkens M.: Comparison of methods for the detection
12 and extrapolation of trends in groundwater quality, *Journal of Environmental Monitoring*, 11,
13 2030-2043, 2009.

14 Vlugt, C. van der, Yu, L., Rozemeijer, J., Van Breukelen, B., Ouboter, M., Stuurman, R. and Broers, H. P.:
15 Dynamics in urban water quality: monitoring the Amsterdam city area, *Geophysical Research*
16 *Abstracts*, 16, EGU2014-16346, 2014.

17 Wade, A. J., Palmer-Felgate, E. J., Halliday, S. J., Skeffington, R. A., Loewenthal, M., Jarvie, H. J., Bowes, M.
18 J., Greenway, G. M., Haswell, S. J., Bell, I. M., Joly, E., Fallatah, A., Neal, C., Williams, R. J.,
19 Gozzard, E. and Newman, J. R.: Hydrochemical processes in lowland rivers: insights from in situ,
20 high-resolution monitoring, *Hydrology and Earth System Science*, 16 (11), 4323-4342, 2012.

21 Wade, A. J., Skeffington, R. A., Halliday, S., Bowes, M. J., Palmer-Felgate, E. J., Loewenthal, M., Jarvie, H. P.,
22 Neal, C., Reynolds, B., Norris, D., Gozzard, E., Newman, J., Greenway, G., Bell, I., Joly, E. and
23 Haswell, S. J.: Hourly to seasonal hydrochemical dynamics in lowland and upland UK river-
24 systems: from process inference to progress in hydrochemical modelling, *Geophysical Research*
25 *Abstracts*, 14, EGU2012-13498-1, 2012.

26 Wade, A., Palmer-Felgate, E., Halliday, S., Skeffington, R., Loewenthal, M., Jarvie, H. and Joly, E.: New
27 insights into hydrochemical processes in lowland river systems gained from in situ, high-
28 resolution monitoring, *Geophysical Research Abstracts*, 15, 7608, 2013.

29 Windolf, J., Thodsen, H., Trolborg, L., Larsen, S. E., Bøgestrand, J., Ovesen, N. B. and Kronvang, B.: A
30 distributed modelling system for simulation of monthly runoff and nitrogen sources, loads and
31 sinks for ungauged catchments in Denmark, *Journal of Environmental Monitoring*, 13(9), 2645-
32 2658, 2011.

33 Windolf, J., Bøgestrand, J., Blicher-Mathiesen, G. and Kronvang, B.: (2013, April). Background nitrogen
34 concentrations in fresh waters in Denmark, *EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts*, 15,
35 2252, 2013.

36

1 **Table 1: Overview of monitoring objectives and time scales for high**
 2 **frequency nutrient monitoring**

<i>Bold references appear in this Special Issue</i>		Short-scale dynamics and extreme events (minutes to weeks)	Seasonal and annual patterns (months to several years)	Longer term behaviour and trends (years to decades)
Hydrological, chemical and biological process understanding (PU)	PU1; Flow regimes and dynamics, hysteresis effects, extremes	Poulsen et al. (2015b) Poulsen et al. (2015a) Outram et al. (2014) Jordan et al. (2014) Wade et al. (2012) Oosterwoud (2014) Neal et al. (2012) Kirchner et al. (2004)	Goyenola et al. (2015) Van der Grift et al. (2016) Halliday et al. (2014) Jordan et al. (2012) Neal et al. (2011, 2012)	Neal et al. (2011)
	PU2; Detection of flow routes, groundwater-surface water interactions, travel time distributions	Rozemeijer et al. (2012) Van der Velde et al. (2010) Wade et al. (2013) Kirchner et al. (2004)	Poulsen et al. (2015b) Shrestha et al. (2013) Van der Velde et al. (2012, 2013) Van der Vlugt et al. (2014) Yu et al. (2015) Neal et al. (2011)	
	PU3; Attenuation and retention processes – surface and ground waters	Rode et al. (2012, 2013) Bierzoa and Heathwaite (2013) Halliday et al. (2014a) Neal et al. (2012) Kirchner et al. (2004)	Rode et al. (2012,2013, 2014) Shrestha et al. (2013) Windolf et al. (2011) Wade et al. (2012) Halliday et al. (2014a) Neal et al. (2011, 2012)	Ernstsen et al. (2015)
Quantification of loads and concentrations (Q)	Q1; Assessment of concentrations, loads, export to downstream waters (lakes, rivers, estuaries)	Campbell et al. (2015) Graeber et al. (2015) Wade et al. (2012) Lloyd et al. (2012) Jordan et al. (2014) Ovesen et al. (2012,(2013) Rozemeijer et al. (2010, 2013) Halliday et al. (2012) Cassidy and Jordan (2011)	Campbell et al. (2015) Ernstsen et al. (2015) Goyenola et al. (2015) Graeber et al. (2015) Van der Grift et al. (2016) Rozemeijer et al. (2016) Wade et al. (2012) Halliday et al. (2012) Lloyd et al. (2012) Ovesen et al. (2013) Wade et al. (2012) Bierzoa et al. (2013, 2014) Jordan et al. (2012, 2014) Oosterwoud (2014) Poulsen et al. (2014) Yu et al. (2015)	Ernstsen (2015) Windolf et al. (2014) Kronvang et al. (2013) Greene et al. (2011)
	Q2; Trend assessment, slopes and directions	Aubert et al. (2013) Lloyd et al. (2014)	Van der Grift et al. (2016) Aubert et al. (2013) Kirchner (2004) Lloyd et al. (2014) Blauw et al. (2013) Jordan et al. (2014)	Aubert et al. (2013) Halliday et al. (2012,2014a) Windolf et al. (2013,2014) Rozemeijer et al. (2014) Broers (2012) Hansen et al. (2012,2013) Broers and vd Grift (2004) Visser et al. (2007, 2009) Neal et al. (2011)
	Q3; Probability of exceedance, compliance with water quality standards	Skeffington et al. (2015) Campbell et al. (2015) Audet et al. (2014) Halliday et al. (2014b) Lloyd et al. (2013) Rode et al. (2014)	Skeffington et al. (2015) Ernstsen et al. (2015) Bierzoa et al. (2013,2014) Lloyd et al. (2012,2013) Jonczyk et al. (2014)	Ernstsen (2015) Halliday et al. (2014a)

	Q4; Water and matter balances, sources apportionment	Rode et al. (2014) Rozemeijer et al. (2010b) Aubert et al. (2013b)	Graeber et al. (2015) Goyenola et al. (2015) Van der Grift et al. (2016) Greene et al. (2011) Rozemeijer et al. (2010b) Aubert et al. (2013b) Wade et al. (2012) Jordan et al. (2014) Poulsen et al. (2014,2015a) Van der Vlugt et al.. (2014) Yu et al. (2015)	Ernstsen et al. (2015) Greene et al. (2011)
	Q5; Test and comparison of equipment	Heusch et al. (2015) Audet et al. (2014) Faucheux et al. (2013) Oosterwoud et al. (2014) Wade et al. (2012) Cassidy et al. (2012) Schneider et al. (2012) Stadler et al. (2015) Jomaa (2015) Heinz et al. (2014)	De Jonge et al. (2012) Vendelboe et al. (2015) Jordan et al. (2013) Rozemeijer et al. (2010c, 2013) Cassidy et al. (2012)	
Operational (real time) management – effects and predictions (M)	M1; Management and mitigation of point sources	Campbell et al. (2015)	Jordan et al. (2012)	Greene et al. (2011)
	M2; Management and mitigation of diffuse sources, land use management	Campbell et al. (2015) Melland et al. (2012) Heinz et al. (2014)	Rozemeijer et al. (2016) Campbell and Jordan (2013) Melland et al. (2013) Jordan et al. (2012) Quinn et al. (2015)	Ernstsen et al. (2015) Windolf et al. (2014) Greene et al. (2011)
	M3; Climate change impacts and adaptations	Graeber et al. (2015) Goyenola et al. (2015) Graeber et al. (2014)	Graeber et al. (2015) Goyenola et al. (2015) Graeber et al. (2014)	

1